

MDL Privilege Number	Production Beg Bates	Production End Bates	Date	Custodian	Author	Recipient	CC	Description	Privilege Claim	PEC Challenges
ABDCMDL_PRIV_00069			1/20/2015	Cherveny, E	Cherveny, E.	May, D.; Hazewski, E.		Email with attachments among client employees discussing legal advice (Campbell, E./Esq.) regarding updates to diversion control forms.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Diversion control is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney does not appear in the metadata and/or attorney involvement is indirect. Only attorney identified is in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_00094			2/18/2015	Cherveny, E	May, D.	Campbell, E./Esq.; Cherveny, E.		Email with attachment from client to in-house counsel seeking legal advice regarding diversion control training.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Only attorney participating in the communication is in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_00310			8/3/2015	Cherveny, E	Caroline, D./Esq.	Hartman, S.; May, D.; Engler, T.	Cherveny, E.	Email from in-house counsel to client providing legal advice regarding draft presentation slides on diversion control process.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Presentation distribution/audience is not provided and/or unproven. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Only attorney participating in the communication is in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_00324			8/6/2015	Cherveny, E	May, D.	Cherveny, E.		Email with attachment among client employees discussing legal advice from the ABC Legal Department regarding draft diversion control policy.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Specific attorney is not identified. Attorney does not appear in the metadata. No attorney involvement is proven. Diversion control is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_00577			4/25/2014	May, D.	May, D.	Hartman, S.; Hazewski, E.; Garcia, E.; Guerreiro, M.; Martin, E.; Kreutzer, K.; St. John, K.		Email with attachment among client employees discussing information prepared at the direction of the ABC Legal Department regarding weekly CSRA summary.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Attorney not identified and/or attorney involvement is indirect. Distribution of weekly report is not proven to be limited. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior discovery rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_00874			3/24/2015	May, D.	Byrne, T.	Caroline, D./Esq.	May, D.	Email from client to in-house counsel seeking legal advice regarding Thoughtspot.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Only attorney participating in the communication is in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_02654			8/9/2013	Hazewski, E.	Hazewski, E.	Garcia, E.; Tomkiewicz, J.		Email with attachment among client employees discussing report prepared by consultant at the direction of in-house counsel (Campbell, E./Esq.) regarding review of the OMP.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Third party involvement destroys privilege. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney does not appear to be involved in communication and/or does not appear in the metadata. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_02660			9/9/2013	Hazewski, E.	Tomkiewicz, J.	Hazewski, E.		Email with attachment among client employees discussing report prepared by consultant at the direction of in-house counsel (Campbell, E./Esq.) regarding review of the OMP.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Third party involvement destroys privilege. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney does not appear to be involved in communication and/or does not appear in the metadata. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_02666			10/3/2013	Hazewski, E.	Hazewski, E.	St. John, K.		Email attaching memorandum from client to in-house counsel (Fox, M./Esq.; Campbell, E. /Esq.) containing report from consultant prepared at the direction of counsel regarding review of OMP.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Third party involvement destroys privilege. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney does not appear to be involved in communication and/or does not appear in the metadata. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.

ABDCMDL_PRIV_02719			8/15/2014	Hazewski, E.	Mapes, M.	Hazewski, E.		Email with attachment from consultant to client employee discussing attached privileged memorandum sent to in-house counsel (Campbell, E./Esq.) regarding ABC OMP review.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Third party involvement destroys privilege. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney does not appear to be involved in communication and/or does not appear in the metadata. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_02720			8/21/2014	Hazewski, E.	Mapes, M.	Hazewski, E.		Email with attachment from consultant to client employee discussing attached privileged memorandum sent to in-house counsel (Campbell, E./Esq.) regarding ABC OMP review.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Third party involvement destroys privilege. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney does not appear to be involved in communication and/or does not appear in the metadata. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_02883			8/3/2007	Gundy, B.	Gundy, B.	Mays, S.		Email attaching ABC Legal/CSRA bi-weekly report with discussion of report among client employees.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Attorney does not appear in the metadata. Specific attorney not identified and/or attorney involvement is indirect. Distribution of weekly report is not proven to be limited. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent w/ prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_02884			8/6/2007	Gundy, B.	Gundy, B.	Zimmerman, C.		Email attaching ABC Legal/CSRA bi-weekly report with discussion of report among client employees.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Attorney does not appear in the metadata. Specific attorney not identified and/or attorney involvement is indirect. Distribution of weekly report is not proven to be limited. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent w/ prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_02885			8/17/2007	Gundy, B.	Gundy, B.	Kenny, C.		Email attaching ABC Legal/CSRA bi-weekly report with discussion of report among client employees.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Attorney does not appear in the metadata. Specific attorney not identified and/or attorney involvement is indirect. Distribution of weekly report is not proven to be limited. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent w/ prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_02886			8/31/2007	Gundy, B.	Gundy, B.	Hazewski, E.		Email attaching ABC Legal/CSRA bi-weekly report with discussion of report among client employees.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Attorney does not appear in the metadata. Specific attorney not identified and/or attorney involvement is indirect. Distribution of weekly report is not proven to be limited. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent w/ prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_02887			8/31/2007	Gundy, B.	Gundy, B.	Kenny, C.		Email attaching ABC Legal/CSRA bi-weekly report with discussion of report among client employees.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Attorney does not appear in the metadata. Specific attorney not identified and/or attorney involvement is indirect. Distribution of weekly report is not proven to be limited. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent w/ prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_02888			9/7/2007	Gundy, B.	Zimmerman, C.	Mays, S.; Ross, P.; Gundy, B.; Crow, R.	Kenny, C.	Email attaching ABC Legal/CSRA bi-weekly report with discussion of report among client employees.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Attorney does not appear in the metadata. Specific attorney not identified and/or attorney involvement is indirect. Distribution of weekly report is not proven to be limited. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent w/ prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_02889			9/14/2007	Gundy, B.	Gundy, B.	Kenny, C.		Email attaching ABC Legal/CSRA bi-weekly report with discussion of report among client employees.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Attorney does not appear in the metadata. Specific attorney not identified and/or attorney involvement is indirect. Distribution of weekly report is not proven to be limited. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent w/ prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_02917			11/9/2010	Tomkiewicz, J.	Hazewski, E.	Tomkiewicz, J.; Kreutzer, K.; Breitmayer, D.		Email with attachment among client employees discussing OMP audit report prepared at the direction of counsel (Swartz, D./Esq.).	Attorney-Client Privilege	Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. No attorney appears to be involved in the communication. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.

ABDCMDL_PRIV_3650			7/25/2014	Mays, S.	Zimmerman, C.	Chou, J./Esq.; Fox, M./Esq.; Greenhall, R./Esq.; Gaddes, K.; Stone, R./Esq.; Bausinger, V.	Guttman, T.; Crow, R.; Gundy, B.; May, D.; Mays, S.; Ross, P.	Email with attachment from client to in-house counsel seeking legal advice regarding CSRA weekly summary.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Distribution or weekly summary does not appear to be limited and/or limited distribution is not proven. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_3654			8/18/2014	Mays, S.	Zimmerman, C.	Crow, R.; Gundy, B.; May, D.; Mays, S.; Ross, P.		Email with attachments among client employees discussing legal advice from in-house counsel (Chou, J./Esq.) regarding CSRA weekly reports.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Attorney does not appear in the metadata. Specific attorney not identified and/or attorney involvement is indirect. Distribution of weekly report is not proven to be limited. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior discovery rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_3680			10/30/2014	Mays, S.	Madsen, G.	Mays, S.		Email among client employees prepared at the direction of in-house counsel (Chou, J./Esq.) regarding CSRA weekly update.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Distribution of weekly report is not proven to be limited. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney does not appear in the metadata. Specific attorney not identified and/or attorney involvement is indirect. Any attorney involvement, if proven, would appear to be limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior discovery rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_3907			7/12/2016	Mays, S.	Hartman, S.	Zimmerman, C.; Eddy, J./Esq.; Norton, R.; Heller, S.; Money, J.	Mays, S.; May, D.; Ross, P.; Hartman, S.	Email among client employees discussing information prepared at the direction of the ABC Legal Department regarding Thoughtspot.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Large distribution indicates lack of privilege. Privilege description is overly vague and/or overbroad to the extent that burden of proving privilege has not been met. To the extent a subject has been provided, it appears to involve a business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4569			4/24/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Mays, S.	Glover, S./Legal Department	Zimmerman, C.	Email with attachment from client to the ABC Legal Department seeking legal advice regarding CSRA weekly summary.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Attorney does not appear in the metadata. Specific attorney not identified and/or attorney involvement is indirect. Any attorney involvement, if proven, would appear to be limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Distribution of weekly report is not proven to be limited. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior discovery rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4570			4/24/2014	Zimmerman, C.	ABC Legal Department	Zimmerman, C.		Draft presentation prepared by the ABC Legal Department regarding diversion control program overview.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Diversion control is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney does not appear in the metadata and/or no specific attorney is identified as required. Privilege claim is inconsistent w/ prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4576			4/30/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Zimmerman, C.	Ross, P.		Email among client employees discussing legal advice from in-house counsel (Greenhall, R./Esq.) regarding speaker on drug diversion at ThoughtSpot.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Drug diversion is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney does not appear in the metadata. To the extent attorney involvement is identified, it appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4577			4/30/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Zimmerman, C.	Crow, R.		Email among client employees discussing legal advice from in-house counsel (Greenhall, R./Esq.) regarding speaker on drug diversion at ThoughtSpot.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Drug diversion is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney does not appear in the metadata. To the extent attorney involvement is identified, it appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.

ABDCMDL_PRIV_4578			4/30/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Zimmerman, C.	Chou, J./Esq.; Nachman, M./Esq.	Greenhall, R./Esq.; Gundy, B.	Email from client to in-house counsel seeking legal advice regarding speaker on drug diversion at ThoughtSpot.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Drug diversion is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4579			4/30/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Zimmerman, C.	Gundy, B.		Email among client employees discussing legal advice from in-house counsel (Chou, J./Esq.) regarding speaker on drug diversion at ThoughtSpot.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Drug diversion is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney does not appear in the metadata. To the extent attorney involvement is identified, it appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4580			4/30/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Zimmerman, C.	Gundy, B.; Crow, R.		Email among client employees discussing legal advice from in-house counsel (Chou, J./Esq.) regarding speaker on drug diversion at ThoughtSpot.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Drug diversion is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney does not appear in the metadata. To the extent attorney involvement is identified, it appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4581			4/30/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Zimmerman, C.	Crow, R.		Email among client employees discussing need for legal advice from in-house counsel (Greenhall, R./Esq.) regarding diversion control training program.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Drug diversion is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney does not appear in the metadata. To the extent attorney involvement is identified, it appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings. <i>Attorney is not included in the metadata. Attorney</i>
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4582			4/30/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Zimmerman, C.	Gundy, B.; Crow, R.		Email among client employees discussing legal advice from in-house counsel (Chou, J./Esq.) regarding diversion control training program.	Attorney-Client Privilege	involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Training for diversion control is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4583			4/30/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Robinson, S.	Chou, J./Esq.; Zimmerman, C.	Caffentzis, A.	Email from client to in-house counsel seeking legal advice regarding drug diversion presentation.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Drug diversion is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Distribution appears to be larger than indicated and/or limited distribution is not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent w/ prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4584			4/30/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Chou, J./Esq.	Zimmerman, C.		Email from in-house counsel to client providing legal advice regarding drug diversion presentation.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Drug diversion is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Distribution appears to be larger than indicated and/or limited distribution is not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4585			5/2/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Zimmerman, C.	Gundy, B.		Email with attachment among client employees discussing information prepared at direction of in-house counsel (Chou, J./Esq.) regarding CSRA weekly update.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Attorney does not appear in the metadata. Specific attorney not identified and/or attorney involvement is indirect. Any attorney involvement, if proven, would appear to be limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Distribution of weekly report is not proven to be limited. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior discovery rulings.

ABDCMDL_PRIV_4603			5/19/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Zimmerman, C.	Archer, P.		Email with attachment among client employees discussing information prepared at direction of in-house counsel (Chou, J./Esq.) regarding CSRA weekly update.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Attorney does not appear in the metadata. Specific attorney not identified and/or attorney involvement is indirect. Any attorney involvement, if proven, would appear to be limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Distribution of weekly report is not proven to be limited. Subject involves a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior discovery rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4644			7/11/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Norton, R.	Freitas, K.	Zimmerman, C.; Oswalt, A.	Email from client to consultant discussing legal advice from the ABC Legal Department regarding draft response.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Privilege description is vague and overbroad such that burden of proving privilege has not been met. No attorney is identified in the metadata and no specific attorney is identified as being involved in communication. Third party involvement destroys privilege. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4645			7/11/2014	Zimmerman, C.	May, D.	Zimmerman, C.; Caroline, D./Esq.; Campbell, E./Esq.; Hartman, S.; Hazewski, E.		Email with attachment from client to in-house counsel seeking legal advice regarding Thought Spot diversion control training.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Training for diversion control is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Distribution appears to be larger than indicated and/or limited distribution is not proven. Attorney involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4649			7/17/2014	Zimmerman, C.	May, D.	Zimmerman, C.; Caroline, D./Esq.; Hazewski, E.; Hartman, S.; St. John, K.		Email with attachment from client to in-house counsel seeking legal advice regarding Thought Spot diversion control training.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Training for diversion control is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Distribution appears to be larger than indicated and/or limited distribution is not proven. Attorney involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4650			7/17/2014	Zimmerman, C.	May, D.	Hazewski, E.; Hartman, S.; St. John, K.; Zimmerman, C.; Caroline, D./Esq.		Email with attachment from client to in-house counsel seeking legal advice regarding Thought Spot diversion control training.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Training for diversion control is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Distribution appears to be larger than indicated and/or limited distribution is not proven. Attorney involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4651			7/17/2014	Zimmerman, C.	May, D.	Byrne, T.; Kline, D.	Zimmerman, C.; Caroline, D./Esq.	Email with attachment from client to in-house counsel seeking legal advice regarding Thought Spot diversion control training.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Attorney is merely copied on the communication. Attorney involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Training for diversion control is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Distribution appears to be larger than indicated and/or limited distribution is not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4653			7/20/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Nachman, M./Esq.	May, D.; Caroline, D./Esq.	Zimmerman, C.	Email from in-house counsel to client providing legal advice regarding Thought Spot diversion control training.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Training for diversion control is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Distribution appears to be larger than indicated and/or limited distribution is not proven. Attorney involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4654			7/21/2014	Zimmerman, C.	Zimmerman, C.	Hazewski, E.; May, D.; Caroline, D./Esq.	Mays, S.; Gundy, B.; Campbell, E./Esq.; Robinson, S.	Email from client to in-house counsel seeking legal advice regarding efficacy of state prescription databases.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Privilege description is vague and overbroad such that burden of proving privilege has not been met. To the extent a subject is provided, it appears to involve a business and/or regulatory matter, and not a legal one. Attorney involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.

ABDCMDL_PRIV_4665			7/28/2014	Zimmerman, C.	May, D.	Campbell, E./Esq.; Caroline, D./Esq.; Zimmerman, C.		Email with attachment from client to in-house counsel seeking legal advice regarding Thought Spot diversion control training.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Training for diversion control is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Distribution appears to be larger than indicated and/or limited distribution is not proven. Attorney involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4934			7/13/2016	Zimmerman, C.	Zimmerman, C.	Mays, S.		Email among client employees discussing legal advice provided by in-house counsel (Chou, J./Esq.) regarding OMP modifications.	Attorney-Client Privilege	OMP modification is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney is not included in the metadata. Attorney involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent w/ prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4935			7/14/2016	Zimmerman, C.	Eddy, J.	Hartman, S.; Zimmerman, C.; Casalenuovo, C./Esq.		Email with attachments from client to in-house counsel seeking legal advice regarding CSRA information for ThoughtSpot.	Attorney-Client Privilege	CSRA information is a regulatory and/or business matter, and not a legal one. Distribution appears to be larger than indicated and/or limited distribution is not proven. Attorney involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.
ABDCMDL_PRIV_4936			7/15/2016	Zimmerman, C.	Zimmerman, C.	Chou, J./Esq.		Email with attachment from client to in-house counsel seeking legal advice regarding meeting agenda.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Privilege description is vague and overbroad such that burden of proving privilege has not been met. To the extent a subject is provided, it appears to involve a business matter, and not a legal one. Attorney involvement appears limited to in-house counsel, and legal advice is not presumed and/or not proven. Privilege claim is inconsistent with prior Discovery Rulings.